1938, sus-
l quashing

ions which
of Amer-
Inc., No.
spectfully
e *Durkee*
nt's con-

nt's brief
itted that
; the plea
hould be

N,
neral.
,
neral.
neral.
orney.
ssion.

FILE COPY

Office - Supreme Court, U. S.
FILED
JAN 9 1939
CHARLES ELMORE CROPLEY
CLERK

No. 310

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1938.

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Appellant,

v.

MANHATTAN LIGHTERAGE CORPORATION.

APPEAL FROM THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY.

BRIEF FOR MANHATTAN LIGHTERAGE CORPORATION

FRANK M. SWACKER,
Counsel for Appellee.

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States,

OCTOBER TERM, 1938

No. 310.

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *Appellant*,

v.

MANHATTAN LIGHTERAGE CORPORATION

APPEAL FROM THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY.

REPLY BRIEF FOR MANHATTAN LIGHTERAGE CORPORATION.

The issues in this case are the same as those involved in *No. 309, United States of America, Appellant*, v. *Durkee Famous Foods, Inc.*, and *No. 311, United States of America, Appellant*, v. *Colgate-Palmolive-Peet Company.*

Counsel for the three appellees have collaborated in a brief in reply to that of the Solicitor General which has been filed in *No. 309.* Accordingly, to avoid reprinting, leave is respectfully asked of the Court to refer to the appellee's brief in *No. 309* as an answer to the Solicitor General's brief herein.

Respectfully submitted,

FRANK M. SWACKER,
Counsel for Appellee.